India

FOR THE

No. 142. New Series.
No. 236. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1900.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 145
India and the General Election ... 148
Generous and Just 149
Our London Letter 150
Notes from Bombay 151
India and the General Election. The Indian Parliamentary Committee 152
The Famine in India:
3,884,000 on Relief 152
The Mansion House Fund 152
English Rule in India: Address by Mr. Naoroji 153
The Indian Educational Service ... 154
Advertisements 155-6

NOTES AND NEWS.

We entirely approve of the policy of the Indian Government in making liberal advances to Native States with a view to enable them to meet exceptional famine expenditure. But it is evident that in thus disbursing public money, the interests of the British Indian taxpayer must not be lost sight of. In our opinion the Government of India is bound in each case to satisfy itself, before granting a loan, (1) that the loan is really needed for famine relief; and (2) that the borrowing State is exercising such reasonable economy in its general administration that the loan will be duly repaid. Clearly the Government of India ought to insist on the State reducing all useless and mischievous expenditure before subsidising it at the expense of the sorely burdened Indian taxpayer.

The Bhaunagar State is a case of point. It has been generally supposed that Sir Muncherjee Bhaunagari has been enabled to live in London, and maintain himself in the House of Commons, to no small extent by means of allowances granted to him by the Bhaunagar State. This may to some have appeared an unnecessary, and even an unwise, expenditure on the part of Bhaunagar; but it did not directly affect the Indian taxpayer, and action was not called for on his behalf. The case however was altogether changed when Bhaunagar declared itself unable to perform its famine duties, and applied to the Government of India for a large loan from the taxpayers' funds. It then became necessary to make some enquiry as to the principles upon which loans were made to Native States. Did the Secretary of State, when sanctioning the loan to Bhaunagar, know—and approve—of the payments to Sir Muncherjee? Does he consider that such political expenditure in England may properly be incurred when a State has no money to feed its own starving subjects? If so, what is the nature of the economy insisted on in the case of States desiring to borrow the Indian taxpayers' money?

Some reasonable explanation seemed called for on these points; and accordingly, in July last, Sir W. Wedderburn addressed a question to Lord George Hamilton regarding famine loans to Native States in general, and the case of Bhaunagar in particular. As regards the Native States in general, Lord George replied that their applications were subjected to such scrutiny and supervision as were possible without undesirable interference. As regards Bhaunagar he said that "the ways and means of the State, its intended expenditure, and the possible economies to be made were considered by the Government of India before the loan was granted." In neither the question nor the answer was any specific reference made to Sir Muncherjee's allowances; Sir W. Wedderburn seems to have rested satisfied with having put the India Office upon enquiry as to the Bhaunagar expenditure in England. But the matter was taken up by the *Times of India*, which indicated where the unnecessary expenditure was to be looked for; and Mr. C. H. Setalvad, (Advocate of the Bombay High Court and sometime member of the Bombay Legislative Council) has now published a letter (reproduced in last week's India) giving details of Sir Muncherjee's emoluments since he retired from service in the Bhaunagar State. According to Mr. Setalvad's figures the State has since 1894 paid to Sir Muncherjee about £1,800 a year, besides travelling allowances; part of this amount being shown in the State accounts as "pension," and part as "political expenditure." Now the retiring pension of a Civil Servant in British India, after 25 years' service, is £1,000 a year, out of which a considerable portion is paid from his own subscriptions; and it does not appear why a larger pension should be granted to a retired employé by a small State whose gross revenue is under £250,000. Then, as regards "political expenditure," does the Secretary of State consider it necessary, or desirable, that a petty tributary State, which cannot meet its current famine charges, should indulge in the luxury of a Member of Parliament all to itself; and would not the reduction of this luxury be one of the "possible economies" to which Lord George referred as deserving the attention of the Government of India before granting the loan?

We wish not to be misunderstood in this matter. Under ordinary circumstances we are opposed to anything like inquisitorial prying into the details of a Chief's expenditure. Indeed we may have something to say, on a future occasion, regarding undesirable interference, by the Political Department, with the discretion of Chiefs when spending money on purposes of a harmless and even beneficial character. Also we have no wish to deprive Sir Muncherjee of any allowances to which he is fairly entitled. But we hold that the Government of India is not justified in parting with the hard-earned money of the British Indian taxpayer to any State that has not reduced all expenditure that is useless and absurd. It seems therefore desirable that the Secretary of State should enquire upon what principles his honourable friend's pension has been calculated; why it is in excess of the pension granted to civil servants by the Indian Government, and what is the nature of the political services rendered by Sir Muncherjee to the Bhaunagar State during his stay in England? If Lord George Hamilton is unwilling to face these questions, perhaps, at the coming general election, some voter in Bethnal Green will ascertain the necessary particulars by means of enquiries addressed to Sir Muncherjee himself? He might at the same time ask what, during his five years in Parliament, Sir Muncherjee has done to support the cause of his unhappy countrymen in India.

The Viceroy continues to send less gloomy news as to the course of the famine. In his telegram of Monday last he reports that there was good general rainfall during the week, and that the "general prospects continue good." The numbers on relief—now stated to be under four millions—are diminishing, and the prices of food-grain are easier. Lord Northcote's weekly message also indicates improvement, though the condition of things in the Bombay Presidency is still terrible. Thus in the famine-stricken districts there were last week 1,401 cases of

cholera (991 being fatal) and in the Native States 2,306 cases (1,473 being fatal). The total number of deaths during the week among persons on relief works or gratuitous relief in the British districts of the Presidency was 3,902—an appalling number. Yet there has been moderate rain, and the crops are said to be thriving except in parts of the Deccan and the Karnatik, where a good fall of rain is urgently needed. As was to be expected at this season, the numbers on gratuitous relief are increasing while the numbers on relief works have decreased. Obviously there is still the greatest need for all the help that the charity of the world is able to offer.

In spite of the discouragement of interpellations, we are glad to see that Indian members of the Bombay Legislative Council put some pointed and useful questions to the Government at the meeting on August 24. Mr. G. K. Parekh elicited from Mr. Monteath that 57 orders of attachment of moveable property in respect of a total Government land revenue demand of Rs. 9,852-1-9 were made in the district of Broach during the year ending July 31, 1899. Some part of the information wanted was refused on the ground of reluctance to add to the collector's present pressure of work. It is well, however, to have a public official affirmation of the fact that "under the orders of the Government no karkuns or village officers are competent to make attachments without special sanction." We have recently seen how important it is that the orders of the Government in this behalf should be stringently carried out. For where is the good of an order if underlings may with impunity disregard it at their pleasure?

Mr. Parekh also evoked the statement that "Government are not aware that any notices specially threatening forfeiture and distraint of moveable property are issued." If Government be inadequately informed on the point, we hope Mr. Parekh will promptly see to it that their ignorance is enlightened. The usual notices of demand in the prescribed form were stated to be in Ahmedabad, 20,044; in Panch Mahals, 1,637; in Kaira, 81,492; in Broach, 17,955; and in Surat, 16,646. The collector of Kaira, it was added, explained the largeness of the numbers in his district as "due to indiscriminate issue by Mamlatdars without orders." This just shows how valuable is a constant watch by Indian members on the proceedings of subordinate officers, and a courageous determination to bring irregularities under the notice of the Government. Again, Mr. Monteath admitted, "it appears that under an erroneous order certain holdings were entered in the village registers (in the district of Broach) as forfeited without intimation of the fact being given to persons interested," but he stated that "the mistake was rectified on coming to the notice of the collector." Mr. Parekh does well to keep his eye on both rayat and collector. The full light of the Council is calculated to obviate deeds of darkness.

Yet again in reply to Mr. Parekh, Mr. Monteath made a useful explanation with reference to revenue payments out of *taccavi*:—

It has been generally recognised by district officers that the people from whom the land revenue should not be levied in the current year are pre-eminently those who should be assisted by the special allotments of *taccavi* which have been made, and on the representations of the Commissioners the rule under which reasons must be recorded for the grant of *taccavi* to occupants from land revenue is due has been suspended. Some collectors have given express instructions to the officers subordinate to them to take care that land revenue is not paid out of *taccavi*, and all have been desired to do so. It does not appear that it is possible to do anything more in the matter.

One is surprised that only "some" collectors should have given such obviously necessary instructions, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Monteath will take special care to ascertain that the "desire" of the Government is duly carried out in practice. Nor is it enough that "it has been generally recognised by district officers" that revenue is not to be paid out of *taccavi*; it is the duty of the Government to make definitely certain that no such thing is done in any case. However, Mr. Monteath added:—

If the hon. member is aware of any case in which revenue assessments have been deducted from *taccavi* advances and will furnish the Government with the necessary information, enquiry will at once be made into the matter.

The point is so specially important in the unprecedented circumstances that we trust the Government will make special efforts to see that its wishes are obeyed, and that Mr. Parekh and others will actively supplement the efforts of the Government.

The ugly allegation of the Government that there have been combinations to escape payment of revenue was brought up by Mr. Mehta, who asked the question :—

Will the Government be pleased to give details of the extent of the combination or individual attempts to escape payments, said to exist among people who are well able to pay the Government assessment on their holdings, specifying the number of individuals so behaving, and the talukas in which their holdings lie?

Mr. Monteath replied :—

Government do not consider it necessary to obtain and publish the details asked for by the hon. member. Extracts, however, from reports of Collectors, showing the existence of such combinations, are placed on the table.

One would have supposed that the Government had "obtained" the details before they made the allegation. The information in the "extracts" may, however, be substantially sufficient. The public ought to know, at any rate, just what they amount to.

When the Bombay Budget opens with a deficit of Rs. 33,40,000, it is scarcely surprising if the authorities are rather reluctant to be liberal in suspension and remission of revenue. Mr. Chandavarkar pointed out that, according to the financial statement, "suspensions in the present famine amount to 84 lakhs as compared with not quite 8 lakhs in the last famine." He then went on to say :—

This amount of 84 lakhs represents about a sixth of the total revenue. It is difficult to believe that, when the crops represented scarcely a fourth of the average annual estimates, the rayats can be safely called upon to pay five-sixths of their dues. We are told in the Financial Statement at page 15 that "with 84 lakhs of arrears it may be regarded as a sign of the moderation of Government that the most that is even expected to be realised is only the equivalent of a single year's demand." It is not easy to follow this statement.

For the Governor has already announced that large remissions will be granted in the Deccan districts, and so "it may be inferred that the amount estimated to be realised represents something more than a year's land revenue so far as the parts of the Presidency other than the Deccan are concerned." But it is Gujerat that causes most anxiety. There, out of a total of 391,662 holdings in the Northern Division, "the holdings under 25 acres number 359,138, nearly half the number being less than 5 acres"; and "it is this class of small holders, which is the largest, that must be kept in view in any policy that might be adopted on the subject of remissions." Thus, Mr. Chandavarkar concludes, "it is permissible to observe that the policy in question will fail of its purpose if the end in view is to realise the equivalent of a single year's demand of land revenue."

Elsewhere in our present issue will be found a special report of the important address delivered by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in London last Monday upon the economic relations of the United Kingdom and India and their effects upon the two countries. At the close of Mr. Naoroji's address the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

That this meeting taking into consideration the fact that the internal administration of India demands reforms that will be of benefit to the Indian population, and that there has been too long a delay in the fulfilment of the promises made by her Majesty the Queen in her Proclamation in 1858, calls upon the Government to give full effect now to the promises made in that Proclamation.

"An Indian Officer," writing in the *Times* (August 21) on "Our Armaments in India," drew a harrowing picture of the insufficiency of the whole system of military defence. He proposed to show

that the armaments of India are hopelessly inadequate, and to a large extent obsolete and out of date; that we are by no means ready for the great struggle for which we have been preparing for so many years, and which may at any moment be sprung upon us; that the *personnel* is insufficient for a war of the first magnitude; that we are wretchedly provided in the matter of transport; that our guns are too few and too obsolete to be of much real use against a European foe; and all this with Russia intriguing in Persia and almost knocking at the gates of Herat.

The revelations of the South African campaign would

prepare one for some similar awakening in India, and no doubt there is a large amount of truth in the criticisms advanced. But the argument hinges mainly on the old bogey of a Russian invasion of India, which has really no more solid foundation than the excited dreams of militarists. It will cost very much more arduous efforts than "intriguing in Persia and almost knocking at the gates of Herat" to disturb the equanimity of any cool-headed Indian Government. And such efforts would inevitably furnish the amplest warning.

We do not follow the details of "An Indian Officer's" exposition, but we think they ought to be carefully considered by the military and political officers with whom lies the responsibility for the defence of India. The writer says, in conclusion:—

> All these matters are perfectly well-known and admitted by the officials of the Government of India. But nothing is being done, or, if being done, then so slowly and so incompletely as to be little better than absolute inaction. To the miserable character of our defences in many places, to the obsoleteness or inadequateness of our armaments, there is one invariable reply: the financial situation does not admit of anything being done.

The Finance Minister, indeed, may well be excused if he cries out loudly against further exhaustion of the Exchequer, after the experiences of the past twenty years. Still a wild scare is a thing to be avoided, and it will be well to examine the situation calmly and betimes, though we hardly see how "the events of the last few months should surely be a warning to us in India, as elsewhere, to put our house in order while there is yet time." Our house ought, of course, to be always in reasonably good order. But here comes in the eternal question of the just appropriation of expenditure on common interests as between Britain and India. It is for Britain to dip deepest in her wallet if further expenditure on armaments be needed.

Now the Simla correspondent of the *Times* puts in his oar (September 18), and backs up "An Indian Officer" with extracts from the semi-official *Pioneer*. The *Pioneer* commenting on the *Times* article, says:—

> The article, which has been regarded at home as so sensational and even as so indiscreet, contains absolutely nothing which has not long been known by every one in this country who is either a soldier or a publicist and who follows with ordinary attention and intelligence the measures adopted by the Government of India for the defence of its possessions. . . . . It is just as well that the Press and the public at home should know how slow is our military progress, since there is sometimes a discernible tendency on the part of English speakers and writers to regard India as far ahead of England in the matter of armaments, whereas the sober fact is that we lag far behind in that respect.

Our Allahabad contemporary considers the British garrison perilously small, and urges an increase of artillery and the introduction of modern guns and defence works. It thinks, indeed, that "it is really time that this ostrich-like policy, which has too long obtained in the Simla India Office, should cease." The Simla India Office, we take it, is pretty sick of transfrontier adventures, and will be in no hurry to despatch troops up to meet Russia at the Kushk terminus, or "on the banks of the Oxus."

A detachment of the West African Frontier Force, under the command of Captain Molesworth, was inspected by the Queen at Balmoral on Wednesday. The men, who spent the night in the barracks at Aberdeen, travelled by train on Wednesday morning to Ballater, and from there drove to Balmoral. The inspection took place in front of the Castle. The Queen, who was accompanied by Princess Henry of Battenberg and the Duchess of York, drove to the ground in a landau drawn by a pair of grey ponies. After the inspection the Queen, addressing the soldiers, said:—

> I am very pleased to see you here. I am very proud of my Indian army, and watch with the greatest interest the excellent work they have been doing, not only in Africa but also in China.

The speech was repeated to the English-speaking sergeants of the Madras and Yoruba detachments by Captain Molesworth, and they in turn translated it to their men.

On August 21, after a prolonged trial judgment was delivered by the Cawnpore Sessions Court in the case of the persons accused of participation in the murder of a police constable and the firing of a plague camp during the recent riot. Four of the accused were acquitted, one was ordered to be transported for life, and—twenty were sentenced to death! No wonder if "there was a sensational scene outside the cutcherry when judgment was delivered, the crowd raising loud lamentations and the women prostrating themselves on the ground." Of course, there will be an appeal. It is impossible that such a sentence should be carried out, particularly in view of the circumstances of the origin of the riot. The *Tribune* (August 25) very naturally remarks:—

> The first impression created by the telegraphic report upon an outsider is that, considering the circumstances of the maladministration of the plague rules that led to the Cawnpore riot, the judgment might serve to strike terror into the hearts of people rather than help in re-establishing their confidence in the magnanimity of British Justice.

A particular prosecution for insanitation has roused the ire of *Power and Guardian*, and led it express in strong terms its opinion of the sanitary action of the municipality. It says:—

> We have often drawn the attention of the municipality to the hellish condition of some parts of the suburbs without any practical result. The defective drainage in the suburbs is a source of danger to public health. Can the Chairman or the Health Officer plead ignorant to the fact?

It is well for the organs of public opinion to keep the public authorities up to the mark. Yet two blacks do not make one white; and, though we pronounce no opinion on the particular case of municipal prosecution, we hope that the individual citizens and the public authorities will actively urge each other to a high state of sanitary excellence. In view of the evil odour attributed so freely to the old municipality, the new municipality certainly ought to set a good example to the inhabitants as well as to enforce their sanitary regulations upon them.

Among the most interesting articles in Mr. John Murray's new *Monthly Review* is one which gives some early pages from the forthcoming Autobiography of the Amir of Afghanistan. Abdur Rahman, it seems, is no devotee of the eight-hours' day:—

> So deeply (he tells us) do my thoughts take possession of me when I am planning various improvements and considering State affairs, that I do not see any of the people who are in my presence. Many nights I begin reading and writing answers to letters, and do not raise my head until I see that the night is past and the morning has come. . . . My doctors and hakims tell me that this never-ceasing activity is the cause of all my illnesses, that I work too hard, and do not take my meals regularly at fixed times. My answer is: "Love and Logic have never agreed together." And as I am a lover of the welfare of my nation, I do not feel my own pains, but the pains and the sufferings and weakness of my people, which I cannot bear for them, and those who have never been in love do not know how sore are the sufferings of lovers.

It is not "all skittles" even on the throne of Kabul:—

> On many occasions I get quite discouraged on account of the misbehaviour of my people, who keep on rebelling, quarrelling, and intriguing against each other, and making false reports of each other to me. I have then to make enquiries to find out the truth, and this wastes more than half of my valuable time; so that as I try to walk in the steps of progress they keep on pulling me back. I get very weary, and sometimes think that their position is unchangeable and their intrigues incurable, and that it is impossible to raise them to that standard which would make them equal to their neighbours in strength and character. I feel that it would be well for me to retire from this life of everlasting anxiety and struggle, and take a quiet, peaceful life somewhere else, leaving my people to fight amongst themselves until they are ruined. But this would be a cowardly action and a refusal to fulfil the duties ordained by the real Almighty Master and Sovereign, for which He has created me.

It must be almost as bad as being a member of Parliament.

Remittances on India for 20 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs.3,73,30,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3$\frac{1}{3}\frac{5}{2}$d. to 1s. 4d. The following amounts were allotted, viz.:—In bills, Rs.15,75,000 on Calcutta at at an average of 1s. 3·941d., Rs.1,40,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3·944d., and Rs.2,85,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3·937d.; and in telegraphic transfers, one lakh on Calcutta at 1s. 4d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 3$\frac{1}{3}\frac{5}{2}$d. will receive about 4 per cent., and for telegraphic transfers at 1s. 4d. in full. Last week remittances for Rs.20,53,038 were sold for £136,371, making the total disposed of from April 1st to Wednesday night Rs.5,89,12,680, producing £3,919,147. Next week 20 lakhs will again be offered.

INDIA AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

PARLIAMENT is to be dissolved on Tuesday next, the new writs will be issued on the same day, and the fifteenth Parliament of the present reign—the Parliament that is to inaugurate the twentieth century—will be summoned to meet on November 1st. Rarely have issues so momentous hung upon the verdict of the constituencies, and for no part of the Empire are the issues more momentous than for the voteless Uitlanders of India. One has but to glance back over the dismal history of the past five years in order to understand how closely the fortunes of India are bound up with the temper that animates the Ministry at home. They have been years of war, famine, and pestilence—of aggression without and repression within the borders of our Indian Empire. Plague and famine, indeed, are not dispensed from Whitehall. But a Government is able, and ought to be willing, to investigate fearlessly the causes which render millions of men unable to resist the first attacks of scarcity, and to adopt measures which may prevent drought from causing a disastrous famine. The Government which is now appealing for a renewal of confidence on the part of the British public has neglected this primary duty. Nor is that all. It has found in the troubles which pestilence brought in its train an occasion, not for forbearance, sympathy and succour, but for measures of legislation and administration of a fiercely repressive kind. It has done those things which it ought not to have done, and left undone those things which it ought to have done. India may well pray to be delivered from five more years of rule by such methods and by such men.

The course of Indian politics resembles a recurring decimal. Looking over the record of Indian topics in Parliament since the present Government was formed one finds the same demands repeated year in and year out but always, or almost always, without success. Two Indian topics, it is true, which played some small part in the campaign of the last Election have now passed into the shadow. One was Chitral. The other was the cotton duties. "Where the British soldier sets his foot there he must remain," was the formula in which Mr. Arthur Balfour five years ago summed up the attitude of the Government towards the "forward" frontier policy. And Chitral has been occupied, to the no small expense of the Indian taxpayer. But the last few years have seen nevertheless a notable slackening of the "forward" policy, largely no doubt in consequence of financial difficulties. It is part of the irony of events that the new departure should have been inaugurated by Lord Curzon who, before he became Viceroy, used to contemplate a time when British would face Russian soldiers across the Oxus. The "forward" policy is not killed, but at least it is scotched. As for the cotton duties, Tory candidates—"Imperialists" do they not call themselves?—mowed down their opponents in Lancashire at the last General Election like grass before a scythe with the promise that an impost so odious to many Lancashire traders should forthwith be repealed. Lord George Hamilton lent himself to this outrageous electioneering dodge in a way that would have covered almost any other Minister with shame. The cotton duties still remain. But it is not likely that they will play any large part in the present campaign in Lancashire. In the first place, political memories are short and Liberal candidates are often no better informed than their opponents. In the second place, the duties have been so modified by this "Imperialist" Government as to transfer to the shoulders of the poorer class of consumers in India the part of the burden which Lancashire was asked to bear. An informed Liberalism would have asked the people of Lancashire at the last Election, and might ask them still, what sort of policy it was in India that produced the financial embarrassments which caused the Finance Minister to fall back upon a revised Tariff Act.

We come now to the recurring decimals. In the Indian Budget debate of 1896 the Indian Parliamentary Committee urged the Government to apply, with the necessary changes of detail, to the expenditure of India the methods of scrutiny which have been employed with excellent results in the case of the United Kingdom—that is, to refer the Accounts and the Budget to a Committee of the House of Commons for report every year before the Budget debate comes on. The same proposal was urged—again without success—in the Budget debate of 1899. The beginning of the year 1897 found the Indian people in the throes of a famine only less disastrous than that from which they are now with difficulty emerging. Accordingly, in the debate on the Address, a demand was put forward for searching enquiry into the condition of the Indian peasants with the view of discovering and removing the causes which render them a helpless prey to the first attacks of scarcity. The demand was repeated—always in vain—in the Budget debate of that year, in the debate on the Address at the beginning of 1898, in the debate on the Budget in 1898, and again during the Session which has just ended. These are the two main purposes to which the Indian Parliamentary Committee has unceasingly directed its efforts. But in 1897—the dark year of the "Poona policy"—another set of problems came to the front, the problems contained in the drastic policy of internal repression which was dictated by ignorance to panic. In the Parliamentary debates of the following year protests against this policy in its various manifestations—the deportation of British subjects without trial, Press prosecutions, the institution of "Press Committees," and the new Law of Sedition—were frequent and vigorous. But these protests, too, were unsuccessful, and the task of undoing the mischief still remains. Finally, as in 1898 a national grant to India was asked on account of the cost of Imperial operations beyond the North-West frontier, so in 1900 a national grant has been asked towards the work of relief in a famine of unparalleled intensity. Once more the request was made in vain.

These, then, are the outstanding questions in Indian politics—the legacy which the moribund Parliament bequeaths to its successor and the new century. To enumerate them is, we venture to suggest, to marshal the topics which it behoves good citizens in the constituencies to keep to the forefront, so far as India is concerned, in the campaign of the present Election. Electors should require, and candidates should be asked to promise, efforts in the following directions:—(1) To secure a national grant towards famine relief—a grant which, as we show once more on another page, is demanded no less by justice than by a wise generosity. But such a gift is at best only a temporary palliative. Therefore there is need of (2) searching enquiry into the causes of famine with a view to their removal. But even this enquiry and its results cannot be very fruitful unless some more efficient check be devised for the growth of unproductive expenditure in India. To this end (3) the Indian Budget debate needs to be made a reality by the annual submission of the Indian Budget, with all necessary evidence, to a Select Committee of the House of Commons. Then (4) we expect from Liberals a strong protest against the present policy of repression in India, and especially against the new Law of Sedition. Finally, in dealing with the war, attention needs to be concentrated upon what has been the subject of repeated questions in Parliament throughout the past five years—(5) the claims of British Indians in South Africa, not in the Transvaal alone, but also in Natal and in Cape Colony. We look to our friends in the various constituencies to claim for these topics their due place in the Election, and to Liberal candidates to give them pro-

minence in their election addresses. And we should like to suggest to Liberal candidates the inclusion in their election addresses of some such paragraph as the following :—

If elected, I undertake to give continuous and sympathetic attention to Indian questions, than which none are more important to the British Empire. In particular I promise to support by voice and vote (1) the free grant of at least five millions to the relief of the present famine; (2) the fearless investigation of the economic causes of famine in India with a view to their removal; (3) the reference of the Indian accounts annually to a Parliamentary Committee in order to make the debate on the Indian Budget a reality; (4) a fair apportionment of burdens between the United Kingdom and India; (5) the abolition of "Press Committees" in India, the repeal of the repressive sections in the new Law of Sedition, and the repeal of Regulations authorising the imprisonment of British subjects without trial; and (6) the legitimate claims of British Indian subjects in South Africa and throughout the British Empire.

As to the chances of the Election, speculation is idle. But it is interesting to note that, while Lord George Hamilton asks for "unanimity," the *Times* and the *Standard* profess that they will be perfectly well satisfied if the present majority of 130 is not reduced below 100. Rarely has the Liberal party entered upon a campaign in a condition of such helpless disunion, and, we must add, such miserable and fatuous timidity. Yet it is the unexpected which happens, and the polling-booths may have some surprises in store. Meantime, we print elsewhere a list of the present members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, with the constituencies they represent, and their majorities when they were last returned. Not all of them are going to the poll—Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Joseph Arch, Sir C. Cameron, Sir A. Holden, Mr. Luttrell, Mr. Carvell Williams, and Mr. John Wilson (Govan) are among those who do not seek the suffrages of the electors. Their loss is to be regretted, and it remains to be seen who will take their places. We trust that all their colleagues of the Indian Parliamentary Committee will be successful, and we shall watch with peculiar interest and the most cordial goodwill the fortunes of Professor Murison in the Bridgeton division and of Mr. A. E. Fletcher in the Camlachie division of Glasgow.

GENEROUS AND JUST.

NOTWITHSTANDING the progress of the monsoon, and partly even by reason of the very rainfall, the condition of the afflicted people in the famine districts continues to be extremely deplorable. Unhappily the Mansion House Fund advances but feebly, and it is to be feared that many charitable people have been and are under the impression that the advent of the rains has all at once saved the situation. No doubt the new crops will grow rapidly, but still they have to grow; and in the meantime the necessities of the poor rayats cry out for continuous assistance. The Government officers are of course carrying out the official programme, and the contributions of the charitable are supplementing the efforts of the Government. Yet it is too plain that all these good works together fail to meet the imperious needs of the wretched people writhing under the calamity of the famine. It is pitiful to reflect how much misery, and how many lives, might have been saved by the prompt grant of a free national contribution of several millions towards the purposes of charity supplementary to the operations of Government. And pity gives place to indignation when one thinks of the wretchedly factitious grounds on which the proposition of the British Committee, moved by Mr. Robinson Souttar, seconded by Sir William Wedderburn, and supported by Mr. J. M. Maclean, was rejected by the House of Commons, at Ministerial instigation, on July 26. Since then some two months have elapsed—two months of painful misery to the rayats, which might so easily, so properly, and so honourably have been obviated. It is, indeed, an element of relief to know that the cruel meanness lies on the heads of the Government, and offends the general sympathetic feeling of the country. But that does not help the suffering rayats.

Lord George Hamilton, it will be remembered, left the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Balfour to make a perverse and ill-informed reply to the motion in favour of a free national grant. But in the course of his statement he had already indicated the official line of action and of argument. Admitting that "conditions may arise under which we may be brought face to face with facts which would necessitate such assistance on a large scale," he did not recognise that such conditions had in fact arisen. Yet it would be difficult to imagine any more grievous conditions than those that have prevailed for many months past throughout the famine districts, in spite of the mitigations of public assistance and private charity. The experience of the present calamity shows that the efforts of Government are confined within too narrow limits, and that even within those limits they have, in spite of the testimonies cited by the Secretary of State, been woefully ineffective. They are based, of course, upon the reports and recommendations of Commissions, modified by more recent experience, and they have saved many lives; but what we contend is that, when all is said and done, many lives have been lost that ought to have been saved, and that would undoubtedly have been saved on more liberal rules of famine administration. But "I for one," proudly and virtuously declared Lord George Hamilton, "have been brought up to believe that if you want to encourage effective economy in India, if you want to ensure financial reform, you must make Indian finance as far as possible independent and self-supporting." "It is not because I have not sympathy with the sufferings of the Indian people," he cried, "but because I believe the course I have adopted is for the truest well-being of India"—that is his great reason for "objecting to and opposing premature proposals to the Imperial Exchequer." One ought to be thankful to find a Secretary of State for India recognising in any form and under any circumstances the virtue of "effective economy in India." Yet it does seem a strangely cruel thing for a Minister who boasts his sympathy with the sufferings of the Indian people to read them a lesson in economy when they are dying for lack of food. And what economy could be more effective than the preservation of the lives of the people and the rescue of them in the day of calamity?

At an earlier point in his statement, Lord George Hamilton remarked on the ways and means of tiding over the immediate urgency of the case. He said :—

Our finances have been so good that I have still £9,000,000 unexpended [that is, out of the loan he obtained three years ago]. After consultation with my advisers I am of opinion that I shall be able, with that and other resources, to meet any demands which the Viceroy or the Government of Bombay may make between now and the end of October. But, of course, there may be difficulties. We may not be able to make available our existing credit; and in that case we shall appeal unhesitatingly to the British Treasury. (Cheers.) I have always held that where life can be saved by expenditure the whole financial resources of the Indian Government must be utilised; and that if, owing to untoward circumstances, we are unable to utilise our credit, her Majesty's Government will in that case come to our assistance. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MACLEAN: Will that be a free grant?

Lord G. HAMILTON: The hon. member must not anticipate. In dealing with the complicated conditions of this famine it is impossible for me now to anticipate the exact shape which that assistance ought to take.

Now, here we are on the verge of October, and the attention of the public will be engrossed in a General Election during the better part of the month. One would be glad to know that the suffering people of India are being adequately relieved even out of the proceeds of the loan. There is not the smallest reason to apprehend any inability of the India Office "to make available our existing credit." There is far more reason to suspect reluctance on the part of the authorities to let the money run out freely enough in the distressed districts. Anyhow, we trust that when a fresh Parliament meets, the evident sense of the country will be satisfied by a free national grant practically redeeming at least five millions of the loan. The gift, though sadly belated by official obstruction of a peculiarly factitious character, would yet convey a precious message of sympathy to our afflicted fellow-subjects and clear the self-respect of the country in the eyes of a censorious world.

We readily agree with Lord George Hamilton on the general principle that Indian finance ought to be "as far as possible independent and self-supporting." A national free gift in sympathy with India, however, stands on a separate and special footing, and in no way whatever infringes upon that sound principle. We confess, never-

theless, that it is difficult to follow Lord George's argument. He said (July 26, INDIA, vol. xiv, p. 66):—

> I feel that a sound system of finance depends upon the development of the material and industrial products of the country. I believe that as soon as this cloud passes we shall be able to make considerable remissions of taxation and so to improve and ameliorate the general condition of the taxpayers. (Cheers.) But I admit that this must be conditional upon fair treatment by the Imperial Treasury as regards the apportionment of the charges in which the two Exchequers have a common interest.

After summarising the main points of the Report, Lord George mentioned £257,000 as the sum assigned to the benefit of India. "At the same time," he added, "I am bound to guard myself by saying that I do not necessarily bind myself to accept all the detailed proposals of the Commissioners." We hope that this saving proviso may be taken to mean that Lord George is going to make a worthy effort to increase materially that poor silly figure of £257,000. It is but a very short way that a quarter of a million will go in remedying the "dire grinding destitution" that Mr. Monteath spoke of the other day as "now overwhelming" Bombay. The revision of the capitation charge—in the justice of which, Sir Henry Brackenbury stated in evidence, "nobody in India believes," and of which, as Mr. Buchanan recommended, "India should be relieved"—ought to yield an additional sum, bringing the total up to £850,000. But even then it is not very clear how Lord George would "be able to make considerable remissions of taxation and so to improve and ameliorate the general condition of the taxpayers," to say nothing of "the development of the material and industrial products of the country." Nearly a million of money would certainly make a welcome beginning of relief to the distressed agriculturists, but much more than that is needed to give any substantial significance to the cheers that greeted Lord George's pious aspirations. And after all he is not yet sure of more than the £257,000.

We would again suggest to the Secretary of State that while British self-respect requires an ample national free gift in sympathy, he should keep his eye on the arrears that are manifestly due to India on the basis of the acknowledged over-charge of £257,000 a year. "Even on twenty years' payment of arrears on the very restricted scale adopted by the Majority of the Expenditure Commission," we wrote on August 31 (INDIA, vol. xiv, p. 113), "we should send to India a contribution of £5,000,000 based on grounds of simple justice." It lies with the Minister for India to insist on this just measure of re-imbursement. A courageous Secretary for India would do vastly more effective work than that; he would be insistent for the recovery of that "debt of millions upon millions" which Mr. Smeaton frankly declared that Great Britain and Ireland owe to the Indian peasant. He would keep steadily before the eyes of the British Government that letter of the Government of India, dated March 31, 1890, and signed by Lord Lansdowne and Lord Roberts, which sets forth how "millions of money have been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments and on fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of the British power in the East." And he would reckon up a very long bill for transfrontier expeditions on Imperial account. By all means let us be generous to India and the Indian people; but at the same time let us not forget to be just.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

ALREADY we are in the thick of the electoral fight. The battle really opened last Saturday with Mr. Asquith's spirited call to arms. Two days later the date of the dissolution was officially announced, but as it had been long foreseen the announcement caused little sensation. So low indeed has the standard of political morality been brought by Lord Salisbury's Ministry that had the announcement not come when it did the public mind would have been perplexed. The meanness of the manœuvre has been freely denounced on the platform and in the Press, nor does anyone question the justice of the indictment. It is simply taken for granted. The only point on which opinion is exercised is that of the expediency of Mr. Chamberlain's move. "Will it pay?" each man asks his neighbour. Mr. Chamberlain believes that it will, and accordingly Lord Salisbury has swallowed his scruples. The contest means life or death to the political career of the Colonial Secretary. It is his election, just as the struggle in South Africa was his war. He has staked everything on the issue. Defeat would mean not merely a personal rebuff but political disgrace—not merely a passing eclipse but irremediable disaster.

Historians are vainly searching the annals of Parliament for a precedent for this singular dissolution. Not since the Reform Act have we had a general election on so old a register. One has to go back, indeed, to the beginning of the century to find even the shadow of a parallel to the Prime Minister's action. Scores of thousands of citizens whose names have just been added to the new register will find themselves compelled to play the part of passive onlookers in the coming contest. Their disfranchisement has the appearance of a deliberate act of policy. A bill of one clause, ante-dating the new register for the purposes of the election, might have been passed through Parliament without an effort. Ministers, however, preferred to make their appeal to an artificially restricted constituency. Those who are disfranchised may fume and fret, but they are stingless. Their more fortunate brethren suffer no sense of grievance, and it is they, after all, who will cast the votes.

London has especial reason to resent the action of the Government, yet the Ministerialists are actually counting on an increase of their strength in the representation of the metropolis. Business is bound to be affected by the succession of elections now foreshadowed. Parliament, School Board, Municipal Councils—all are to be renewed within the next two months. The municipal contests are more likely to evoke the true opinion of London than the Parliamentary struggle. They will be conducted on the basis of a fresh register, whereas the greater and more momentous issue is to be settled by an appeal to the survivors of the old lists. What this means may be gathered from the fact that in one Metropolitan division alone there have been about a thousand removals since the beginning of the year. If the electors in other divisions have been changing their addresses at the same rate the number of lost votes in London will probably have to be put down at nearly 100,000. At present the Liberals are provided with candidates in two-thirds of the London constituencies. They can scarcely do worse than in 1895, and may easily do much better. London and Lancashire are the Ministerial citadels. If they fall, or even waver, not even Birmingham will have power to save its ex-Mayor.

Forecasts of the result of the struggle are already in the market. Prophecy is at no time a more gratuitous form of error than on the eve of a general election. Some of us remember the discomfiture of the astrologers in 1880, and most of us retain a lively recollection of the unexpected débâcle of 1895. One can only with safety record his impressions of public feeling, and even then with a word of warning as to the uncertainty of the barometer. What were Lord Beaconsfield's impressions of public feeling in 1880? Did not many of the experts predict an evenly balanced result in 1895? At the polls votes count for more than noise, and we have yet to learn the mind of the silent voter. One thing is certain, and that is the declension of the khaki fever which at one time seemed to threaten the very existence of the Liberal party. Ministerialists will be thankful if they hold their own in the fight. A few months ago they were talking of the admittance of a few Liberal members, partly as an act of grace and partly as a means to carrying on the game.

Most of the Front Bench men will keep their seats without difficulty. Mr. Chamberlain, of course, is supreme in Birmingham. A good local candidate is opposing Mr. Balfour in East Manchester, but his friends are confident of the Tory leader's success. Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Goschen, Sir M. Hicks Beach, and Sir M. White Ridley are all ensconced in strongholds of Conservatism, and if you take the minor members of the Government you find that most of them enjoy a similar security. Mr. Walter Long is the only minister who has had to seek a change of constituency, while Mr. Horace Plunket and Mr. T. W. Russell are perhaps the only members of the Government whose seats are believed to be in actual jeopardy.

Ex-ministers, with the exception of Mr. John Morley and Sir William Harcourt, are less fortunately placed than many of their opponents. The majorities by which they were returned at the last election were in some cases extremely small. But

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman is safe, and so is Mr. Asquith. The latter, indeed, will probably be re-elected by an increased majority. Sir H. Fowler has usually been returned unopposed. Both Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Morley are certain to come back, each with a great majority. Sir Edward Grey's re-election is equally certain. On the other hand, some doubt is entertained as to the fate of Mr. Bryce, and we are also warned that Mr. Herbert Gladstone will have to face a desperate fight in West Leeds. For the rest, the leaders of parties may confront the struggle, so far as they are personally concerned, with equanimity.

Reconstruction is no longer in the air. Lord Lansdowne has received a testimonial from his former Under Secretary, Mr. Brodrick, and is, therefore, still entitled to be regarded as a trusted member of the Cabinet. But should the Government be successful at the polls, the Secretary for War will probably be promoted to a more ornamental office. Similar promotion will perhaps be conferred on himself by Lord Salisbury. As Prime Minister, pure and simple, he will be enabled to overlook, if not to control, Mr. Chamberlain's performances as—shall we say?—Foreign Secretary. Reconstruction, however, is for the moment in abeyance. The question may never arise at all. A Liberal majority at the polls would settle it, at least, for five years.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, September 1.

We had our Provincial Legislative Council on the 24th ultimo, at which the Provincial Budget was, as usual, discussed by our non-official representatives in that assembly. This Budget in the first place is belated. It should have been discussed immediately after the Imperial Financial Statement was debated at Calcutta. All the sister Presidencies and Provinces follow that course. Only Bombay is exceptional in this respect. As the new Revenue Member remarked in reference to our land revenue system, they never can get out of the fossilised traditions of centuries. And the "Kingdom of Bombay," as historians record, has the oldest traditions. So it is, I suppose, only fitting that the modern inheritors of those traditions should religiously follow the principle of never doing anything until it is sufficiently ancient and likely to have lost all interest. Practically, therefore, the discussion of the Provincial Budget five months behind the time is a stale and unprofitable affair. It is a weariness to the flesh to see the flogging of the dead horse. And when that Budget shows that provincial finance is bankrupt, one may imagine what interest it can evoke. Of course the Assyrians had this time and the year previous to disgorge their ill-earned gains from the provincial surpluses of Bombay. Last year they gave 20 lakhs. This year they give 33 lakhs to wipe off all deficit, apart from extra expenditure on plague and famine. Such was the mournful tale recounted in the Budget. It praised the "generosity" (?) of the Assyrians who at every renewal of the Provincial Contracts so ruthlessly deprive the provincial sheep of all the fleece they may have acquired. This is a sore point with us. We put it squarely before the Royal Commission which quietly ignored (I mean the majority) the irrefragable case which the different Indian witnesses made out in favour of more equitable treatment. Under the circumstances it was natural that our *doyen* of the Legislative Council should again take up the parable, after having ridden it to death in the Council of the Assyrians themselves.

The Hon. Mr. P. M. Mehta, like the knight-errant of old, again made a fight on behalf of his Province, though he did not miss giving a bit of his mind to the Provincials themselves to the effect that it was their own want of fight that had lost them many and many a lakh of surplus revenue on which the Assyrians had pounced. Why did they not use that surplus, the fruits of their own diligence, to meet the many crying wants and needs of the people of the Bombay Presidency? Here is the deplorable result. They give away light-heartedly what rightfully belonged to them; and when at their wits' end in their hour of need they supplicated grace. And the gracious Assyrians unbent, and out of the "generosity" of their heart gave them back what was really their own.

The other topic of interest which almost all non-official members vied with each other in bringing to the notice of the Council was the wretched condition of the mass of the rayats—those to be counted by lakhs who own patches of fields averaging 7 to 25 acres, paying a land assessment of Rs. 14 to Rs. 50 per acre. Appeals of a most stirring character were made for generosity to these destitute waifs. Statistics were brought in support. The heaviness of the load of increasing land indebtedness was clearly shown. Their condition of serfdom was well pointed out. But all this made next to no impression on the Government, with its brand new Revenue Member by its side—the same whose miserable famine policy has been the theme of so much unfavourable criticism in the Press and to which the Special Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* so admirably referred in his speech at the Westminster Palace breakfast. The Government was stern of mood. It harped on that stock plea so well known to us all. There should be no mercy for those who are able to pay but who are "contumacious" enough not to pay. It seems indeed strange that the Revenue Member cannot view the situation without his own official glasses. Who has appealed to him to remit the land tax on behalf of the contumacious? None. Moreover, what may be the number of such? It is insignificant—infinitessimally small compared with the lakhs of those destitute and woe-begone waifs of whom I have already spoken. The fact is, there is a determination to grab the current year's revenue by any means and at all hazards. By a variety of means the authorities have already recovered 30 and 40 per cent., and in some places even 70; so that they are in no mood to relent. This, in substance, is the sorrowful tale. "Strike hard, rivet stronger, give no whit of ease." That is the shibboleth of the tribe of the Revenue-wallas. You may, therefore, imagine to what plight the indigent rayats will be reduced for some years to come. Not even bumper harvests will rehabilitate them and make them stand on their legs. On the contrary, such is th[illegible] infatuation of the Revenue authorities that they alre[illegible] express the sanguine hope of recovering almost every p[illegible] their suspended dues next year owing to abundant ha[illegible] which exist only in their imagination. Lord Northc[illegible] unable to relieve the present dismal situation or give [illegible] iota of promise to the people's representatives on th[illegible] that mercy, by way of remissions, will at all be shown. Poor Governor! What is he to say, being so new, and frightened out of his wits by his "responsible advisers" (a precious and delicious phrase to describe an irresponsible junta) to do aught which may endanger the financial position, already grown so weak? The fact is that in revenue matters no Governor, however strong, can override the Revenue Member who is master of the situation. The woe or welfare of the millions of poor cultivators depends on the policy pursued for the time being by these Revenue oracles of the day. Even Lord Reay, a strong Governor, was helpless before the masterful Sir Charles Pritchard. So what can ever be expected from mild Lord Northcote? When the land system was attacked, Mr. Muir Mackenzie was put up to repeat the old shibboleth of "light assessment," with which we are so painfully familiar. And then the Revenue Member himself oracularly declared that we must take the system as we find it. It may be good or bad. There it is. It has existed for more than a century. Reform in that system, even admitting it to be bad, is not possible, because, after all, the hallowed traditions of more than a century must be preserved. What superb logic! What statesmanlike sentiments! Who, after these declarations, will plead for the poor rayat? The *non possumus* of the Revenue Member for the time being is as portentous as the nod of Imperial Jove.

The Máháráján of Bharatpore has been deposed, and his heir acclaimed to the Gadee. In its resolution the Government informs the public why an euthanasia had to be performed on the person of the ex-Máháráján. He was never even a *persona grata* with his own father, who had implored the Imperial authorities to veto his succession to his throne. But those august authorities did not want to take that extreme view. Ample latitude was allowed so that the Máháráján might reclaim himself. But, alas! all Imperial forbearance and indulgence were lost on him. At last forbearance could not be extended when the Prince murdered in his own rooms a confidential servant. So here is the deposition. The Press generally agrees in the verdict, but observes that Lord Curzon might have come to this conclusion a little later on, *after* appointing a judicial commission to enquire into the lamentable facts and

giving the Mahárájá an opportunity to explain his conduct. How far are the allegations correct? That is the point. The facts, according to the Native Press, should have been sifted *coram populo*, and not *in camera* on the *ex parte* evidence of the Political Agent.

Lastly, Cawnpur is in a state of ferment and indignation at the extraordinary sentence of hanging passed on twenty of those who were alleged to be seriously implicated in the recent murderous riots. The sentence is considered most harsh, and doubts are expressed as to the identification of the real persons who committed the murders. It is a difficult question. When sentences of this character are pronounced confidence in the justice of British rule is shaken. The incident makes a most unfavourable impression on the mass of the population. Lord G. Hamilton has confessed that somehow the British Indian Government is not popular. Is it possible for it to be popular with this kind of justice and the other positive miscarriages of justice where Europeans are criminals?

INDIA AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

THE MEMBERS OF THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

In view of the dissolution of Parliament on Tuesday next, it may be interesting to set out the names of the present members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, together with the constituencies they represent, and the majorities they obtained when they were last returned. The list is as follows:—

Member.	Constituency.	Majority.
Allan, W.	Gateshead	483
Ambrose, R.	Mayo (West)	Unop.
Arch, Joseph	Norfolk (N.-W.)	1,297
Ashton, T. Gair	Bedfordshire (Luton)	186
ainbridge, E.	Lincolnshire (Gainsboro')	776
ker, Sir John	Portsmouth	734
ley, Thomas	Derbyshire (Chesterfield)	247
g, J.	Yorkshire, W. R. (Keighley)	840
nan, T. R.	Aberdeenshire (E.)	1,415
John	Battersea	253
[illegible]	Morpeth	2,169
J.	Lanarkshire (Mid)	71
Sir Chas.	Glasgow (Bridgeton)	125
[illegible]	Durham (Houghton-le-Spring)	881
Cawley, F.	Lancashire (Prestwich)	101
Channing, F. A.	Northamptonshire (East)	1,216
Clark, Dr. G. B.	Caithness	1,300
Colville, J.	Lanarkshire (N.-E.)	537
Commins, Dr.	Cork Co. (S.-E.)	Unop.
Condon, T. J.	Tipperary (East)	Unop.
Crombie, J. W.	Kincardineshire	563
Curran, T. B.	Donegal (North)	Unop.
Dalziel, J. H.	Kirkcaldy	1,956
Davies, M. Vaughan	Cardiganshire	1,179
Dilke, Sir C. W.	Gloucester (Forest of Dean)	Unop.
Donelan, Captain	Cork Co. (East)	Unop.
Ellis, John E.	Nottinghamshire (Rushcliffe)	683
Esmonde, Sir T. G.	Kerry (West)	Unop.
Farquharson, Dr.	Aberdeenshire (W.)	220
Fenwick, Chas.	Northumberland (Wansbeck)	3,207
Field, Wm.	Dublin City	Unop.
Flynn, J. C.	Cork Co. (North)	Unop.
Gilhooly, J.	Cork Co. (W.)	Unop.
Goddard, D. F.	Ipswich	177
Gold, Chas.	Essex (Saffron Walden)	425
Gourley, Sir E. T.	Sunderland	43
Harrington, T.	Dublin City	Unop.
Harwood, G.	Bolton	552
Hazell, W.	Leicester	99
Hogan, J. F.	Tipperary (Mid)	Unop.
Holden, Sir Angus	Yorkshire, E. R. (Buckrose)	90
Holland, W. H.	Yorkshire, W. R. (Rotherham)	1,957
Horniman, F. J.	Falmouth	49
Hutton, A. E.	Yorkshire, W. R. (Morley)	1,668
Jacoby, J. A.	Derbyshire (Belper)	575
Jones, D. Brynmor	Swansea	1,832
Jones, W.	Carnarvon (Arfon)	1,619
Kearley, H. E.	Devonport	268
Kilbride, D.	Galway (North)	565
Kitson, Sir Jas.	Yorks., W. R. (Colne Valley)	539
Lambert, G.	Devon (South Molton)	1,360
Langley, Batty	Sheffield (Attercliffe)	Unop.
Lawson, Sir W.	Cumberland (Cockermouth)	241
Leese, Sir J. F.	Lancashire (Accrington)	340
Leng, Sir John	Dundee	2,202
Lewis, J. Herbert	Flint	165
Leuty, T. R.	Leeds (East)	711
Logan, J. F.	Leicestershire (Harboro')	1,026
Lough, T.	Islington	463
Luttrell, H. C. F.	Devon (Tavistock)	373
Lyell, Sir L.	Orkney and Shetlands	781
McCartan, M.	Down (South)	673
McCarthy, Justin	Longford (North)	Unop.
MacNeill, J. G. S.	Donegal (South)	2,301
McKenna, R.	Monmouthshire (N.)	762
McLaren, C. B.	Leicestershire (Bosworth)	1,120
McLeod, J.	Sutherlandshire	495
Mandeville, F.	Tipperary (South)	501
Montagu, Sir S.	Whitechapel	22
Morgan, J. L.	Carmarthenshire (W.)	1,040
Morton, E. J. C.	Devonport	209
Norton, Captain C.	Newington (West)	450
Nussey, T. W.	Pontefract	57
O'Brien, J. F. X.	Cork City	333
O'Connor, Jas.	Wicklow (West)	Unop.
Palmer, G. W.	Reading	694
Pease, Sir J. W.	Durham (Barnard Castle)	1,076
Pickersgill, E. H.	Bethnal Green (S. W.)	279

Member.	Constituency.	Majority.
Pinkerton, J.	Galway City	190
Priestley, Briggs	Yorkshire, W. R. (Pudsey)	470
Provand, A. D.	Glasgow (Blackfriars)	380
Price, R. J.	Norfolk (East)	198
Randell, David	Glamorgan (Gower)	3,818
Rickett, J. C.	Scarborough	24
Roberts, J. Bryn	Carnarvon (Eifion)	Unop.
Roberts, J. Herbert	Denbighshire (West)	1,603
Robson, W. S.	South Shields	133
Roche, John	Galway (East)	Unop.
Samuel, J.	Stockton-on-Tees	472
Schwann, C. E.	Manchester (North)	455
Scott, C. P.	Lancashire (Leigh)	677
Shaw, C. E.	Stafford	12
Sheehy, D.	Galway (South)	Unop.
Sinclair, Captain	Forfarshire	458
Smith, Samuel	Flintshire	451
Souttar, Robinson	Dumfriesshire	13
Spicer, Albert	Monmouth	154
Stanhope, Hon. P. J.	Burnley	321
Stuart, Jas.	Hoxton	128
Thomas, Alfred	Glamorganshire (East)	2,146
Tuite, Jas.	Westmeath (North)	Unop.
Ure, A.	Linlithgowshire	17
Walton, J. Lawson	Leeds (South)	161
Wason, E.	Clackmannan	516
Wedderburn, Sir W.	Banffshire	510
Weir, J. G.	Ross and Cromarty	863
Whittaker, T. P.	Yorkshire, W. R. (Spen Valley)	821
Williams, J. C.	Nottinghamshire (Mansfield)	1,387
Wilson, C. H.	Hull (West)	5,237
Wilson, F. W.	Norfolk (Mid)	134
Wilson, H. J.	Yorkshire, W. R. (Holmfirth)	1,452
Wilson, John	Lanark (Govan)	261
Wilson, John	Durham (Brancepeth)	1,642
Wilson, J. Havelock	Middlesbro'	2,020
Woods, S.	Essex (Walthamstow)	279
Young, Samuel	Cavan (East)	Unop.
Yoxall, J. H.	Nottingham (W.)	513

Not all of these gentlemen, however, will on the present occasion go to the poll. Among those who retire are Sir William Wedderburn, M.P. (hitherto Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee), Mr. Joseph Arch, Sir Charles Cameron, Sir Angus Holden, Mr. Luttrell, Mr. Carvell Williams, and Mr. John Wilson (Govan).

Special interest attaches to the campaigns of new candidates who are known to take a sympathetic view of Indian questions. Among these special mention may be made of Mr. A. E. Fletcher (late editor of the *Daily Chronicle*), who is standing for the Camlachie division of Glasgow, and Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D., who is standing for the Bridgeton division of Glasgow.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

3,884,000 ON RELIEF.

GOOD GENERAL RAINFALL.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated September 17:—

"Famine. Reports show good general rainfall during week, especially in Gangetic Plain and Punjab, Madras, Central India, Rajputana. General prospects continue good. Numbers relieved are diminishing, and food-grain prices easier. Number of persons in receipt of relief:— Bombay, 1,132,000; Punjab, 36,000; Central Provinces, 1,756,000; Berar, 189,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 54,000; Rajputana States, 111,000; Central India States, 60,000; Bombay Native States, 142,000; Baroda, 53,000; North-Western Provinces, 1,000; Punjab Native States, 20,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 34,000; Hyderabad, 279,000; Madras, 4,000; Bengal, 13,000. Total, 3,884,000."

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Governor of Bombay:—

"Following are figures for week ended September 8:— Famine-stricken districts, 1,401 cases of cholera, of which 991 were fatal. Native States—cases of cholera, 2,306; deaths from cholera, 1,473. Total number of deaths among numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief— British districts, 3,902, or 3 2-5 per mille. Rain moderate to slight. Crops are thriving except in parts of Deccan and Carnatic, where good fall of rain urgently wanted. Numbers on works have decreased. Numbers on gratuitous relief increasing.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers exceeded on Wednesday night £370,000.

The *Investors' Review* writes (September 15):—

Apparently, thanks in part to the recently optimistic-looking telegrams from the Viceroy, an idea prevails that there is no necessity for further help to the Indian people suffering from famine and plague. It would be a pity were this view to be retained. For by the latest of these Viceregal advices we learn that 4,334,000 people are still in receipt of relief, or more than the entire population of Scotland. Lord Curzon declares that a steady fall in relief numbers may be expected, and possibly this is true, but it must be recollected that the bulk of those remaining are people absolutely destitute, with no resources either in the shape of farms to go to or of work as labourers on the farms of others. Destitution, in short, if contracted and touching fewer numbers, becomes more intense, and the misery of those who remain calls more urgently for help than ever. At the same time, the ravages of the plague and of other scourges increase, so that it requires a very robust optimism indeed to look hopefully upon the future of the afflicted portions of our Indian dominion. The apathy of the English people has never been really dissipated, but it is hardly the people's fault. Officialism has been dead against any full disclosure of the extent and nature of the calamity with which a large area of the Peninsula has been afflicted. It did not suit the policy of the present Government to tell the truth, partly because it had no money to spare for India's necessities. Therefore millions of the population have been allowed to die, and the destitution of those remaining alive is so great that many years of prosperity would be required to obliterate its effects. It is necessary to insist upon this view even to wearisome iteration, because the consequences of neglect to us as an Imperial people must be disastrous should we continue in our present indifference. India cannot at one and the same time pour thirty odd millions sterling of money into this country every year and perish the while of destitution. Timely Government help would therefore have been a good investment, putting the matter on the lowest basis—a help that would have saved the cattle of the farmers, kept the old and the young out of their graves, released the oppressed cultivator from the tyranny of the local usurer, and by the execution of extensive irrigation works prevented the recurrence of calamities such as the country now suffers from, would have been so much additional security to us. As it is, in spite of the heroic work done by many a humble official in the way of famine relief and of much kindly benevolence from individuals in this country, the neglect of the authorities, the absolute indifference of the Home Government, and the absence of abundant funds with which to supply the wants of the people lying beyond the satisfying of their immediate hunger, have contributed to weaken the basis upon which our material interests in India rest.

The *Westminster Gazette* wrote (September 15):—The very latest official reports from India are more favourable. The prospects of autumn crops continue good and a steady fall in relief numbers is expected. For this we are all thankful. Meantime shocking accounts of the ravages of the famine still come to hand. Some extracts given in *India* this week from a missionary report by the Rev. Dr. A. H. Browne, throw a lurid light upon the sufferings of the people in the Bhil country in Northern Gujerat. Dr. Browne tells how he went the rounds at night to "try and find if any corpses were lying about, so as to have them protected from dogs and other animals till the body-burners came on duty at daylight":—"I met with the body of one woman; beside her were three or four children. Yesterday morning I went out soon after six a.m., prowling about; seven bodies were found lying in one place or another, and four came from the hospital; up to two p.m. six more corpses were picked up, and a few more came from the hospital. . . . . And so it goes on day by day—death, disease, and famine-stricken all around one." Sir George Chubb complains in the *Times* to-day of the little concern shown by the British people about the slaughter and ill-treatment of their fellow-countrymen in China. Have the "British people" shown the concern that they ought to have shown concerning the appalling loss of life in India?

ENGLISH RULE IN INDIA.

ADDRESS BY MR. NAOROJI.

[From our own Reporter.]

A meeting was held on Monday night at the London Patriotic Club and Institute, Corporation Row, Clerkenwell, when an address on the condition of India was given by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, formerly M.P. for the division. The chair was taken by Mr. J. Poole, President of the Club, and there was a large and sympathetic audience, which included Mr. J. Benson, L.C.C., the Liberal candidate for the constituency at the coming election.

The Chairman, in very briefly opening the proceedings, said the subject on which they had met to hear Mr. Naoroji discourse was one which was very near to that gentleman's heart and ought to be near their own, in view of their responsibilities towards the great Empire of India.

Mr. Naoroji said the question of the relations of Great Britain with India was day by day becoming a more important matter for the consideration of our legislators, and it was time that the mass of the British people should realise more clearly their tremendous responsibilities in this direction. The point to which he proposed specially to address himself on that occasion was that of the economic relations between Great Britain and India. In the middle of the last century, when England first obtained power in the northern provinces, the action of the administrators of British interests was such as to draw from the Court of Directors itself the pronouncement that their corruption "was unequalled in any time and in any country." And, unhappily, the principle of greed on which the administration of that day was based had not been eradicated. To the cost of the wars we had made in India the British people had not contributed a shilling, and it was mainly at the cost of Indian blood, also, that the British Empire in India had been built up. With what result had every farthing and almost every drop of blood been drawn from the Indian people? The Indian people were not British citizens—they were simply British helots. Moreover, whereas in the case of European wars—that between France and Germany, for instance—there was but one payment, in the case of India there was a constant bleeding—an unceasing drain such as no country on the face of the earth could stand. Even at the beginning of the century the drain of capital from India was estimated at three millions a year; now it was about thirty millions. And as this exhaustion of capital had gone on, so, necessarily, had the producing capacity of India also diminished, with the result that, whereas in Great Britain each person produced on an average £41 per annum, each inhabitant of India could not produce even the value of £2. And it must not be forgotten that the pressure on the Indian people was much greater than that on the people of Great Britain, for, whereas the latter had but to give of their abundance, the former must find wherewith to pay from their wretchedness and misery. The Indian people had to find every year some 200,000,000 rupees to be paid to Europeans, and of that amount a very large proportion went absolutely out of the country and became dead, so far as the natives of India were concerned. Or, if it did go back to India, it returned under the name of British capital, still further to exploit Indian land and labour, with the result, as he had said, of a drain of something like 30 millions a year. In England every penny raised by taxation remained in the country, and if that were the position in India the Natives would have nothing to complain of; but out of every 5s. raised there by taxation 1s. went entirely out of the coun[illegible] and that meant that the people of India had to work like slav[illegible] find a shilling to help Europeans before they could find a s[illegible] penny to help themselves. But in addition to that, the [illegible] capitalists had to do with the revenues of the people, and t[illegible] was that the whole of India practically existed for the bene[illegible] British. They were sometimes told that India was in [illegible] with the British Empire, but the conditions of partnersh[illegible] every pie for the carrying on of the undertaking must [illegible] one partner, and every pie of the proceeds taken by the other. England, in fact, was the master and India was the slave. Kipling had told them something of the white man's burden, but Kipling's was a romance—the actuality was the burden laid by the white man on the backs of the Indians, a burden never equalled in any age throughout the history of the world. The burden was, indeed, becoming too heavy for even that long-suffering race. They were told from time to time of the recuperative power of India—how, for instance, she had built herself up after repeated famines—but that was due to the fact that the Government of India, knowing that open additional taxation would not do, had increased the taxation nearly 40 per cent. during the last few years by the simple device of compelling the taxpayer to give a rupee of 16d. of gold, when he had hitherto been obliged only to give a rupee of 10d. or 11d. of gold. That was how the recuperation was brought about. There was really no such thing as recuperation. It was no difficult thing to have a surplus of income over expenditure when one could put one's hand into another man's pocket and take out what one wanted. But a real surplus of income over expenditure there never had been in India, and there never would be. That, briefly, was the state of the economic relations between India and Great Britain and the effects of those relations were famine, plague, and war. Anglo-Indians were continually saying, "Oh, India is far more wealthy than she ever was before"; but there were two Indias—the India of the British and the India of the Indians. The India of the British was prosperous enough certainly, and the more the country was bled the merrier it was for the India of the British. But what was the India of the Indians? They had read during months past how millions were dying of plague and famine, and that they could realise; but what was the normal condition of the rural population of India? Millions were now perishing by famine, but scores of millions had never, from their birth to their death, known what it was to have a full meal. A state of chronic starvation prevailed so far as the great mass of the rural population was concerned. There was not, indeed, on the face of the earth so poverty-stricken a country as India, in spite of the much-vaunted British rule. In 1833 it was definitely stated by Act of Parliament, and the statement had since been affirmed by two Royal Proclamations, that Indian and all other British subjects were to be treated alike. If the principle of the Act of Parliament and the subsequent proclamations had been adhered to India would not have been discontented. The fulfilment of the righteous promises then made would have been sufficient, but the Executive of those days was too much blinded by greed to give effect to them, and the result, as he had said, was that India was being bled to death. He had hardly the heart to dwell further on the

results of the iniquitous system under which India was governed by England. When he made his first public speech, very many years ago, he expressed his faith in the conscience of the British people, and that faith he retained to the present day. Had it not, indeed, been for that faith he felt that he would scarcely have had the energy to keep on crying in the wilderness, with no better result than that presented by the condition of India to-day. And, indeed, he admitted that the intention of the British Parliament, as manifested in the Act of 1833, was beneficent; but it had, unhappily, been defeated by the action of the Executive. He specially wished, in closing, to point out what the effects of the economic relations between the two countries were upon the English people themselves. There was a section of the English people, mostly belonging to the "classes," which secured a very large proportion of the 30,000,000 drained from India. That meant that the "classes" were every year strengthened by the addition of 30,000,000 to their resources. Consequently the capitalists were ever stronger, and how, then, could the workers struggle with them? And though India had a population of 300,000,000, and might under other conditions be a magnificent market for British goods, how much produce did we export thither? Only about to the value of 2s. per head of the vast population, whereas to Australia Great Britain sent goods to the proportion of £7 value per head, and to America to the proportion of 20s. or 30s. value, notwithstanding the protective duties in the latter case. Did not his hearers think that if the money that had been drained from India for so many years past had been left to fructify in the hands of the people of that country there would have been a greater demand in India for British produce? Why, Great Britain would probably then have exported to India alone as much as she now exported to the whole world. As it was, the "classes" were adding 30,000,000 yearly to their resources, the [illegible]asses" had their powers of production hampered, and to the [illegible] of India the result was starvation and destruction. The British [illegible]ad declared for a policy just and wise, but to that declaration, [illegible] by the sovereign, the Executive had never given effect—on [illegible]ry, they had violated in the most outrageous way the promises [illegible]hat would be the consequence? Could this injustice go on [illegible]ord Salisbury had said, "Injustice will bring down the [illegible] ruin," and if Great Britain went on inflicting that [illegible]ophet was needed to foretell what the end would be. [illegible]ple should insist on their Executive faithfully and [illegible]ying out the promises made in the Queen's Proclamations and in the Act of 1833. If that was done, both the British and the Indian people would be blessed; but if it was not, then injustice would bring down the mightiest to ruin. (Cheers.)

At the close of Mr. Naoroji's address questions were invited, and somebody in the hall asked whether Russian rule would be better than that of England. That, Mr. Naoroji replied, was a decidedly large question, but he did not see that the possibility of worse rule by Russia justified bad rule by England. Moreover, every improvement in the English government of India rendered Russian rule less likely, because under a just government England would have all India at her back to resist aggression. (Cheers.)

Mr. McAlister moved, "That this meeting, taking into consideration the fact that the internal administration of India demands reforms that will be of benefit to the Indian population, and that there has been too long a delay in the fulfilment of the promises made by her Majesty the Queen in her Proclamation in 1858, calls upon the Government to give full effect now to the promises made in that Proclamation."

Mr. Benson, in seconding, expressed a belief that deep-seated in the hearts of Englishmen was a desire that justice should be done to our great dependency of India, and that the only difficulty lay in directing public attention towards the matter and making it a living question.

The resolution was carried unanimously, and it was decided that copies should be sent to the Prime Minister and to Lord George Hamilton.

A vote of thanks was then passed to Mr. Naoroji, who, in replying, pointed out that the responsibility for the condition of India lay with the mass of the people of England. (A voice: "Not the workers.") Yes, with the workers, because it was the workers who were to-day supreme, and it was the fault of the workers if they did not use their power, and they who must be blamed if they did not do their duty. (Cheers.)

A vote of thanks to the Chairman closed the meeting.

THE INDIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICE.

The following letter appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* of September 13 last:—

Sir,—From the summary that has reached India of the correspondence that has recently taken place between Lord George Hamilton and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on the subject of appointments in the Indian educational service we learn that the Secretary of State for India referred Mr. Naoroji to an answer given in the House of Commons in 1898 on a similar subject, and from which it appears that the India Office holds that "there is nothing to prevent the selection of the Natives of India" for appointment in that service. I feel bound to expose the difference between the enunciation of such a generous and spacious principle and its practical operation. The educational service of India is divided into two branches, the superior or the more highly-paid branch, known as the Indian educational service, and the subordinate or the ill-paid branch, which goes by the name of the provincial service. Those who are appointed in England by the India Office get into the superior service, and draw very handsome pay, with prospects of ever-increasing salary, while those who are appointed in India, either by one of the provincial Governments or by the Government of India, have to remain content with very poor emoluments and poorer prospects. Now, the contention at present lies about the chances of duly qualified Natives of India getting into the upper or the Indian educational service. Lord George Hamilton says, more with grim humour than with kindness, that "there is nothing to prevent them" from getting into it. I beg to tell you how for the last fifteen years at least none of them has been able to get into it.

I will confine my remarks to the case of Bengal alone. Of the few Bengal gentlemen who have distinguished themselves in one or other of the British Universities and have subsequently entered the educational service of their country since the year 1885, I know it as a matter of fact that most of them at first tried to be appointed in England, and had to wait there for an unconscionable length of time in getting their applications considered. And when they were considered, the reply in all cases was "no vacancy," though vacancies were found from time to time for European graduates. As regards the merits and attainments of some of these Indian gentlemen, of men like Drs. J. C. Bose and P. C. Roy, who have won European reputation, of men like Messrs. J. N. Das Gupta, M.A. (Oxon.), D. N. Mullick, B.Sc. (London), B.A. (Cantab., Wrangler), and Dr. P. N. Chatterji, D.Sc. (Edin.), the India Office was not kept in the dark, and could not plead entire ignorance. And yet much less competent and distinguished men have been able to secure the patronage of the India Office because of their being Europeans by birth. The last case that I have to cite will pointedly show how Indian merit is recognised and appreciated at the India Office. Dr. S. C. Moholanabis, B.Sc., a Bengali by birth, who was found competent enough to occupy a chair at the University College of Cardiff, acting for a period of two years for one of England's greatest physiologists, Professor Haycroft, tried for about two years to get an admission into the educational service, and during this long term, though many berths have been found for European graduates, no "vacancy" could be found by the India Office for Mr. Moholanabis. Facts like these speak for themselves and need no comments.

Speaking at the twelfth session of the Indian National Congress, Mr. A. M. Bose, a gentleman whom most of your readers have heard of and many have seen, a distinguished Wrangler, a member of the last Education Commission appointed by the Government of India, a Fellow of the University of Calcutta, and for some time its elected representative in the Bengal Legislative Council, and the President of the fourteenth Indian National Congress, observed:—"Within the last twelve years there have been six appointments of Indian gentlemen educated in England, and educated successfully so far as all the tests there are concerned. These six gentlemen, who have been appointed to the Education Department in these years, have all of them been appointed in India. Not that they did not try to get appointed in England. No, gentlemen; after taking their degrees in the great English and Scotch Universities, after having won all their high distinctions—distinctions not less high than those of their English brethren in the service, in some cases perhaps even higher—they tried their very best, they made what I may almost describe as frantic efforts at the India Office to get an appointment from England. But all their efforts were in vain. After waiting and waiting, and after heart-rending suspense, they were told that they must ship themselves off, as soon as they could, to India, for the Government to appoint them there."

When one remembers that even-handed justice cannot be had even for appointments in the Indian educational service, a service in which Government could afford to do justice to indigenous merit without running any risk, one despairs of the condition of the people of this country under British rule. It is useless to recall in these "Jingo" days the magnanimous clauses of that memorable and historic dead letter which the Queen issued over her own name and with which her reign was inaugurated in this country. It is no good recalling to our mind the broad and liberal utterances of Elphinstone and Monroe, of Lord William Bentinck, Lord Macaulay, and Sir Charles Trevelyan. It is more than useless to point out breaches of honoured pledges. But even in these degenerate and reactionary days we think we can hope that our Government will no more treat us with a course, as the *Daily News* pointed out some time ago, of "double-dealing and shuffling," and make sweet promises to our ear in order to break them to the hope, to quote a memorable expression from a memorable despatch of the late Lord Lytton. The Indian people are getting intelligent enough to know what promises and diplomatic phraseology and smooth excuses mean, and anything that tends to lessen the Indian people's trust in British justice and British veracity must prove in the long run to be a dangerous and risky policy for the Empire.—Yours, etc.,

Prithwis Chandra Ray, Assistant Secretary to the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee.

Calcutta, August 16, 1900.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1899):
ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT, C.I.E.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET, UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROW, BOMBAY.

ASSIST.-SEC.: ALFRED NUNDY, Bar.-at-Law, GORAKHPUR.

STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P., *Chairman*.
W. C. BONNERJEE.
G. B. CLARK, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
B. B. JOSHI.
J. SEYMOUR KEAY.
SARAT MULLICK.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.
J. M. PARIKH.
G. P. PILLAI.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.P.
NILKANT B. WAGLE.
ALFRED WEBB.
W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.
TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	Bupendra Nath Bose, Esq., and J. Ghosal, Esq. (Prithwis Chandra Roy, Assist. Sec.), 62, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Babu Satis Chandra Chakraburty, B.L., Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., B.L., Dinajpur.
8. Pabna	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District)	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Babu Nibarim Chandra Bannerjee, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur	Muzaffarpur District	Babu Preo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. Comilla	Comilla	Babu Rajoni Nath Nundy, Comilla.
20. Chittagong	Chittagong District	Babu Mohendra Lal Das, Chittagong.
21. Chapra	Chapra	Babu Hem Chandra Mitter, Pleader, Chapra.
22. Darbhanga	Darbhanga District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerjee.
23. Motihari	Champaran District	Babu Annoda Prasad Banerjee, Pleader, Motihari.
24. Krishnagar	Krishnagar	E. P. Banerjee, Esq., Pleader, Krishnagar
25. Arrah	Arrah	Babu Raghbir Saran, Arrah.
26. Khulna	Khulna	Babu Veni Bhusan Roy, Pleader, Khulna.
27. N.-W. Provinces	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the	*N.W.P. for the purpose of distributing* "INDIA."	
Name of Sub-division.	Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapur District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Bareilly.
Allahabad	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
28. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow; Munshi Janki Pershad, Pleader, Rai Bareilly; Secretary, Congress Committee, Gonda; Pandit Manohar Nath Supra, Fyzabad.
29. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jaishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore.
30. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
31. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
32. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal, Gopalrao Ramchandra Dabholkar, Esq., B.A., LL.B., and Maganlal Ghelabhar Mehta, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
33. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
34. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
35. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Shrinivas Krishna Bakshi, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Bijapur.
36. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Narayan Gurunath Kargudin, LL.B., Dharwar.
37. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
38. Ahmadnagar	Ahmadnagar District	Mohanlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
39. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Districts	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
40. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
41. Nagpur	Central Provinces	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Nagpur.
42. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
43. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
44. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
45. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
46. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
47. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
48. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
49. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. V. Ramesam, High Court Vakil, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. **Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration of their address, t[illegible] the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "India."**

[illegible]TISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," [illegible] Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 62, Bow Bazar Street, [illegible]CHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; JAISHA RAM, [illegible]gress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOKS.

Nos. I., II., & III. NOW READY.

I. THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST, By Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P. (being a Series of Suggestions for the Prevention of Famine in India). Price 7d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 7 annas.

II. ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE: Evidence-in-Chief of the Five Indian Witnesses. Price 1s. 10d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., R. 1. 4.

III. THE PROPOSED SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN INDIA. Memorial to the Secretary of State for India. With Two Appendices. Price 1s. 2d., post free; in India, by V.V.P., 14 annas.

London: Published by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, S.W.
In India: Copies may be obtained from D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.

Open Letters to Lord Curzon
ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

London: Kegan Paul & Co., price 7/6. Obtainable in India through any bookseller.

"Mr. R. C. Dutt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that an excessive land tax renders the agricultural population unable to face two or three successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. . . . . Mr. Dutt is on less debatable ground in pleading for a reduction of the annual drain to England and for the more extended mployment of the Indians in civil employ."—*The Times.*

"Mr. Dutt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, areas of recurrent famine have been identical with those of excessive assessment."—*The Daily News*

"Nothing could be better than the book on Indian Famines which Mr. Dutt has just published in the form of some Open Letters to Lord Curzon. It is thoroughly informed, well-reasoned, and temperate; it tells the inquiring man exactly what he ought to know."—*The Daily Chronicle.*

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plea, hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilise native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works hould be constructed, and tha the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be ...ced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his ...ry of the subject and makes good his claim to the attention of the governing authorities." ... *World.*

His view that it is inequitable to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to ...sed for the general purposes of the Empire has the support of many high authorities who ...y no means to be described as Little Englanders."—*Literature.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address. The services of a recent visitor to the Famine districts are available.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.*

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

TRADE MARK

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very seful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1900.

VOL. XIII.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "India," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898), XI. (Jan.-June, 1899), XII. (July-Dec., 1899). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "India,"
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA,* 84 *and* 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternos... London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, ...